



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,794	05/18/2006	Jae Heun Kim	WELL 108 US	4879
7590 03/09/2010				
John W. Renner Renner, Otto, Boissell & Sklar 1621 Euclid Avenue 19th Floor Cleveland, OH 44115			EXAMINER ROSEN, NICHOLAS D	
			ART UNIT 3625	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/09/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/539,794

Applicant(s)

KIM, JAE HEUN

Examiner

Nicholas D. Rosen

Art Unit

3625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 June 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SG-08)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- _____ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Interval Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-11 have been examined.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it should be in clear and idiomatic English, preferably without element numbers. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: There are contradictions between the numbering of elements in the specification and the numbering in the drawings, and also contradictions within the specification. Figure 1 has 120 as "Wireless purchaser", but the specification (page 14, line 4) refers to "product stock managing server 120".

Figure 2 has 216 as "Electronic approval server", but the specification (page 8, line 14) has "product stock managing server 216", and also (page 9, line 1; page 14, line

21; page 15, line 16) has “electronic payment server 216”, and (on page 13, line 21, through page 14, line 1) “electronic information payment server 216”. Furthermore, claims 9 and 10 recite “electronic payment server 216” (fifteenth and twenty-first lines of claim 9; ninth line of claim 10).

Figure 2 has 258 as “Electronic approval DB”, but the specification has “electronic payment DB 258” (page 8, line 11; page 10, line 10; page 11, lines 2 and 7), and “payment information DB 258” (page 13, line 17), and “electronic payment information DB 258” (page 13, lines 20-21). Furthermore, claims 4 and 8 refer to “electronic payment DB 258” (third line of claim 4; third line of claim 8).

Also, on page 10, lines 8-9, the specification recites, “the product information DB 250 includes product information DB 258” and then a list of other things. Presumably, the product information DB 258 does not include itself.

The specification further refers to “providing an electronic payment information service (S342)” (page 14, lines 19-20), to “S344” (page 15, line 1), to “user approval and payment approval step S364” (page 16, lines 9-10), and to “an error correcting step S382” (page 16, line 8). Moreover, claim 9 recites “user approval and payment approval step S364” (twenty-fifth line). Claim 10 recites “a step S342 for receiving an issuance of an electronic payment” and a “step S344”. Claim 11 recites “a step S382 for correcting an error”. “S342”, “S344”, “S364”, and “S382” are in the drawings.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

The claims are objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

Claims 1-8 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of claim 1, "the network" technically lacks antecedent basis, and should be "a network". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: In the fourteenth line of claim 3, "payment server 218" should apparently be "payment server (216)". (Examiner writes "apparently" because of the problems with the elements to which number refer.) Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 6, Examiner wishes to inquire whether "a quality of products sold" (in the fifth and sixth lines) should be "a quantity of products sold".

Claims 9-11 are objected to because of the following informalities: In the third line of claim 9, "the network" technically lacks antecedent basis. In the thirteenth line of claim 9, "the product sale managing server" technically lacks antecedent basis, as do "the electronic payment server 216" in the fifteenth line and "the product sale means

200" in the eighteenth line. In the thirteenth line of claim 9, "provided" should be "provides". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 3 recites the limitation "said product sale unit 210" in the first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, or in claim 1, on which claim 3 is stated to depend. Claim 3 should either be amended to avoid this recitation, or else made dependent on claim 2, which does provide antecedent basis for a product sale unit 210.

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "said product information DB 250" in the first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, or in claim 1, on which claim 4 is stated to depend. Claim 4 should either be amended to avoid this recitation, or else made dependent on claim 2, which does provide antecedent basis for a product information DB 250.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention. Claim 5, which recites that the product code approval server "218" includes a PDA, a cellular phone, a cash stored card with a communication function, and a remote controller with a communication function, appears to contradict the instant specification, page 9, lines 15-19, which states that the product code approval server 218 may be connected with (not may include) a PDA, a cellular phone, etc. Therefore, claim 5 is interpreted for examination purposes as reciting that the product code approval server "218" is connected to at least one of a PDA, a cellular phone, a cash stored card with a communication function, and a remote controller with a communication function, as presumably in accordance with Applicant's intention. Correction or clarification is required.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 5 recites the limitation "said product code approval server 218" in the first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, or in claim 1, on which claim 5 is stated to depend. Claim 5 should either be amended to avoid this recitation, or else made dependent on claim 3, which does provide antecedent basis for a product code approval server 218.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 6 recites the limitation "said electronic payment approval code approval" in the first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is unclear how a code, as such, can include a plurality of methods.

Claim 7 also recites "a WILS method", which is ambiguous, because it could be taken as referring to either Web Integration Links or Wired Internet Loop. The specification does not make this point clear.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 8 recites the limitation "said product information DB 250" in the first line. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim, or in claim 1, on which claim 8 is stated to depend. Claim 8 should either be amended to avoid this recitation, or else made dependent on claim 2, which does provide antecedent basis for a product information DB 250.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. In the fifteenth and sixteenth lines, claim 9 recites, "the electronic payment server 216 provides an electronic payment information to the product or the advertisement." One can provide payment information to a buyer, a credit card issuer, or to other parties, but it is not clear what it means to provide payment information "to the product or the advertisement."

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 10 recites, "the manufacturer of the product and the advertisement" (lines 5-6 and 7-8). Not only does this lack antecedent basis, at least the first time, it raises the questions of whether the manufacturer is also the seller from whom purchase is requested, of what it means to be "manufacturer" of an advertisement, and whether the manufacturer of the product need be the same as the manufacturer of the advertisement.

Claims 1-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The claims are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos et al. (U.S. Patent 6,029,141) in view of official notice. As per claim 1, Bezos discloses an electronic commerce system using an electronic payment information in which a commercial transaction is achieved between a purchase means of a purchaser and a sale means of a seller on a network, comprising: a purchase means in which a purchaser receives a selling product and service information and purchases a corresponding product or service (Figure 1; column 6, lines 1-20); a product sale means in which a product or service having an electronic payment recognition code information of a product code and a product model sold on the network is sold (Abstract; Figures 1, 7, and 8; column 6, lines 1-20; column 11, line 63, through column 12, line 27; column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 4); a home shopping means connected with the network in such a manner that a direct commerce transaction is achieved between the purchase means and the product sale means (Abstract; Figures 1, 7, and 8; column 4, line 50, through column 5, line 3; column 6, lines 1-20 and 31-47; column 11, line 63, through column 12, line 27; column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 4); a newspaper or TV advertisement means (column 1, lines 40-46; column 8, lines 32-48); and a financial payment proxy organ connected through the

network in such a manner that a payment is achieved between the home shopping means or the newspaper or TV advertisement means and the purchase means (column 6, lines 41-58; column 15, lines 28-50). Bezos does not expressly disclose a delivery company for delivering the products, but does disclose shipping products to purchasers (column 3, lines 8-25; column 6, lines 12-20 and 41-47), and official notice is taken that delivery companies which deliver products are well known (e.g., United Parcel Service). Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have a delivery company for delivering the products, for the obvious advantage of arranging for the ordered products to be shipped and delivered.

As per claim 2, Bezos's disclosed product sale means (Abstract; Figures 1, 7, and 8; column 6, lines 1-20; column 11, line 63, through column 12, line 27; column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 4) can be considered a product sale unit, and Bezos discloses a product information database connected with the product sale unit for managing a data base of product information (column 7, lines 41-45; column 14, lines 12-37).

As per claim 3, Bezos discloses a product providing server for selling the products in wholesale or retail sale (column 11, lines 1-15; column 12, line 53, through column 13, line 8; column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 16); Bezos discloses shipping products to purchasers (column 3, lines 8-25; column 6, lines 12-20 and 41-47), discloses collecting payment (e.g., column 6, lines 41-47), and implies accepting credit cards (column 18, lines 30-35), requiring a sale managing server for receiving a

payment code of the product code and product model of the products from the product sale unit and an information of the purchaser, and managing a sale status of the product so that the product is delivered to the purchaser. Furthermore, Bezos discloses storing a payment code of the product code and product model of the products and an information status of the purchaser (column 12, line 43, through column 15, line 50; column 18, lines 30-3), implying an electronic payment server to store the information to an appropriate database. Bezos does not expressly disclose a product code approval server connected with the electronic payment server for approving a payment information based on the products sold by the company codes of a requesting seller, but Bezos discloses that customers' credit cards may be declined (column 18, lines 30-35), and official notice is taken that it is well known for credit card companies or other financial institutions to have computers and for approving or disapproving attempts to use credit cards, or other financial transactions. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to have such a product code approval server, for the obvious advantages of having credit transactions approved when proper, or disapproved when purchasers are trying to make purchases with stolen credit card numbers or the like.

As per claim 4, Bezos discloses a product information database (e.g., column 7, lines 41-45; column 14, lines 12-37), and further discloses a purchaser database (e.g., column 7, line 61, through column 8, line 31), a seller database (e.g., column 7, lines 41-45; column 15, lines 28-50), a product sale database (column 6, lines 48-58; column 7, lines 21-45), and an electronic payment database (column 6, lines 48-58; column 7,

lines 21-40). Official notice is taken that it is well known for a database to include smaller databases. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the product information database to include the other databases, for the obvious advantages of efficiently organizing a computer database, and readily accessing the various kinds of information stored, as needed.

As per claim 5, Bezos does not disclose that the product code approval server includes, or is connected to, a PDA, a cellular phone, a cash stored card with a communication function, and a remote controller with a communication function. However, official notice is taken that it is well known for people to use PDA's, cellular phones, cash stored cards with communication functions, and remote controllers with communication functions to access computers. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the product code approval server to include or be connected to one of the listed devices, for the obvious advantage of enabling people to engage in electronic commerce, and make or authorize payments, when not sitting at their home computers.

As per claim 6, Bezos does not disclose that electronic payment approval code information of the product includes a product model recognition code, a sale code provided to each sold product, an address code of a seller, a member classification code of a purchaser who purchased a product, a corresponding member name and ID, a sale time at the time when the product is sold, a quality (or quantity?) of products sold, and a sale price. However, official notice is taken that it is well known for payment

approval information of a product to include various identifying information, such as the date, name of the purchaser, place of purchase, seller identification, sale price, identification of the product purchased, etc., etc. (This should be familiar to some degree to anyone who receives credit card statements, and more familiar to anyone who has had a credit card issuer call him to ask whether unusual purchases or orders which triggered a flag were in fact authorized.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the electronic payment approval code information of the product to include various items of information, for the obvious advantage of verifying the purchase, and identifying it should any dispute arise.

(Furthermore, the particular information recited as being included in electronic payment approval code information would in any case not make the claim patentable, being non-functional descriptive matter. At least, this is the case if the claims do not recite particular methods of generating the information in question, or particular methods of processing it once generated and included, which could not equally well be done with other sorts of information.)

As per claim 7, Bezos does not disclose that the electronic payment recognition code of the product code and product model includes a WINC (Wireless Internet Numbers for Content) method or code, a WILS method or code, an ENUM (Telephone Number Mapping) method or code, and a URN (Uniform Resource Name) method or code, but official notice is taken that WINC, WILS (possibly either Web Integration Links or Wired Internet Loop), ENUM, and URN are well known. Hence, it would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention to apply these methods as a recognition system for each company or user, for the obvious advantage of recognizing users, and, e.g., matching them with their existing shopping carts, or otherwise providing offers, advertising, etc. specific to a user; or verifying that an attempt to place an order and pay by, e.g., credit card originates where it should originate.

As per claim 8, this is obvious for the reasons set forth with regard to claim 4 above.

Claims 9 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bezos et al. (U.S. Patent 6,029,141) in view of official notice. As per claim 9, Bezos discloses an electronic commerce method using an electronic payment information in which a commercial transaction is performed between a purchase means of a purchaser and a sale means of a seller on a network, comprising: a step of connecting a purchase means to a network for issuing/registering/managing an electronic payment recognition code (Abstract; Figure 1; column 4, line 50, through column 5, line 3; column 6, lines 1-20 and 31-47; column 6, line 59, through column 7, line 45; column 11, line 63, through column 12, line 27; column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 4). Bezos further discloses that a customer may select a merchant website, and in particular code information of a product code and product model, from a home shopping means or a newspaper advertisement or TV advertisement means (Abstract; Figures 1, 7, and 8; column 1, lines 40-46; column 4, line 50, through column 5, line 3; column 6, lines 1-20

and 31-47; column 6, line 59, through column 7, line 45; column 8, lines 32-48; column 11, line 63, through column 12, line 27), and in particular from an advertised product group list (Figure 10a; column 15, lines 28-50), and Bezos discloses providing a list of the products which a purchaser has selected to the purchaser (column 13, lines 10-42). Bezos further discloses that an electronic purchase is requested using an electronic payment information service of the product sales means that prepared the products and advertisements in an electronic payment information providing step (Abstract; Figures 1, 7, and 8; column 4, line 50, through column 5, line 3; column 6, lines 1-20 and 31-47; column 11, line 63, through column 12, line 27; column 14, line 62, through column 15, line 50). Bezos does not expressly disclose that the electronic payment server that performed the electronic purchase request step approves a corresponding payment content confirmation and a user approval for thereby approving a payment, but official notice is taken that it is well known to approve confirmations and approvals. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for the electronic payment server to carry out these approvals, for at least the obvious advantage of assuring that a payment is valid and approved by the user and/or a credit card issuer or other party.

Bezos does not expressly disclose a step in which the product is delivered in the case that there is not any error in the user approval and payment approval step, but Bezos does disclose shipping products to purchasers (column 3, lines 8-25; column 6, lines 12-20 and 41-47), from which one can conclude that the product is normally

delivered in the case that there is not any error in the user approval and payment approval step.

As per claim 11, Bezos does not disclose that user approval and payment approval include a step of correcting an error when there is an error, but official notice is taken that it is well known to correct an error when there is an error. (Users are often given the opportunity to review their work, and in particular, detection of an error or inconsistency can result in a notification and a warning to make corrections.) Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of electronic commerce at the time of applicant's invention for user approval and payment approval include a step of correcting an error when there is an error, for such obvious advantages as not shipping a product to the wrong address, attempting to charge a purchase to an invalid credit card, etc.

The prior art has been applied to the claims, especially claims 9 and 11, only insofar as the claim elements as recited have been found tolerably comprehensible; as noted above in the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, there are some serious problems with the clarity of the claims.

Claim 10 is so far from comprehensibility that Examiner has not been able to compare the claim elements to the prior art, and reach a judgment as to whether the claim may be obvious or non-obvious. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, as set forth above, and will be considered under 35 U.S.C. 102 and 103 when and if it is amended so as particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Ikeda (U.S. Patent 5,938,727) discloses a communication system and method via digital codes. Kobayashi (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0034659) discloses a simplified method and system for e-commerce operable in on-line and off-line modes (note in particular paragraphs 42 and 43 for scanning bar codes or other indicia for ordering a product). Gorelick et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication 2002/0072968) disclose a system and method incentivizing online sales (note in particular paragraph 73 for URL's that may be used to access a Web page).

The anonymous article, "Dress Barn Selects NaviSite to Launch E-Commerce Venture," discloses an e-commerce site with cross-promotional capabilities.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nicholas D. Rosen, whose telephone number is 571-272-6762. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey A. Smith, can be reached on 571-272-6763. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Non-official/draft communications can be faxed to the examiner at 571-273-6762.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Nicholas D. Rosen/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3625
March 3, 2010